Supreme Court, U S
FILED
MAY 20 2010
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No 09-1016

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

ANTONIO C SIMONELLI,
PETITIONER

v

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT BERKELEY, THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, THE SCHOOL OF LAW (BOALT HALL), JOHN P DWYER, DEAN OF THE SCHOOL OF LAW, VICTORIA ORTIZ, DEAN OF STUDENTS OF THE SCHOOL OF LAW

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

PETITION FOR REHEARING

ANTONIO C SIMONELLI
pro se

P O Box 119
Ross, CA 94957
(415) 453-1781
zumbolt@yahoo com

CURRY & TAYLOR ♦ (202) 393 4141

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	ii
RELEVANT PROVISIONS INVOLVED	2
STATEMENT	4
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION	7
CONCLUSION	14
APPENDIX	
Supreme Court Denial Letter	1b
Email dated 11/20/2000	2b
Letter dated 2/6/2002	3b
Academic Transcript	7b

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

CASES

BETHEL SCHOOL DISTRICT V FRASER, 476 US 675 (1986) 12
CITY OF LADUC V GILLEO, 512 US 42 (1994) 8, 9
GITLOW V NEW YORK, 268 US 652 (1925) 8
HAZELWOOD V KUHLMEIR, 484 US 260 (1988) 12
LOVELL V CITY GRIFFIN, 303 US 444 (1938) 8
MORSE V FREDRICK, 551 US 393 (2007) 12
ROTH V UNITED STATES, 354 US 476, 484 (1957) 10
TINKER V DES MOINES INDEPENDENT COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT, 393 US 503 (1969) 11
WEST VIRGINIA STATE BOARD OF ED V BARNETTE, 319 US 624 (1943) 11

STATUTES

28 C F R § 35 160 2, 3
42 U S C § 12132 1, 2

RULES

U S Sup Ct Rule 44 2 1

REGULATIONS

28 C F R Part 35 2, 3

PETITION FOR REHEARING

Antonio C Simonelli ("Simonelli" or "Petitioner") respectfully prays that a Petition for Rehearing issue to review the order of this court entered April 26, 2010, denying the petition for a writ of certiori and is reprinted at App page 1b, *infra*

This petition for rehearing is timely filed with this court under U S Sup Ct Rule 44 2

A rehearing is warranted because substantial grounds at the heart of this petition were not previously presented – *the University of California, Berkeley School of Law, violated Petitioner's First Amendment rights of the freedom of speech and the freedom of assembly*

This case concerns the failure of the University to provide the petitioner with enlarged-text reading materials prior to classes so that he could read, study, prepare for each class, communicate his ideas to others and associate and assemble with his classmates and professors – as are his rights under the First Amendment that affords all individuals – regardless of wealth or power – disabled or non-disabled – the ability to convey their expressions and assemble and associate with others

Title II of the Americans With Disabilities Act (42 U S C Section 12132) ("ADA") provides that disabled persons cannot be excluded from or denied the equal benefits of public services Title II requires a public entity to provide accommodations to enable disabled persons to obtain equal services The case invovles post-secondary higher education at law school

RELEVANT PROVISIONS INVOLVED

The First Amendment, "Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech, or the right to assemble "

The Fourteenth Amendment Section 1, " no state shall deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law "

The Fourteenth Amendment Section 5, "The Congress shall have power to enforce by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article "

Section 202 of Title II of the Americans With Disabilities Act ("ADA") (42 U S C § 12132) provides

> Subject to the provisions of this subchapter, no qualified individual with a disability shall, by reason of such disability, be excluded from participation in or be denied the benefits of the services, programs, or activities of a public entity, or be subjected to discrimination by any such entity

Code of Federal Regulations, Title 28, Part 35, Subpart E – Communications (28 C F R Part 35) provides

> § 35 160 General
>
> (a) A public entity shall take appropriate steps to ensure that communications with applicants, participants, and members of the public with disabilities are as effective as communications with others

(b)(1) A public entity shall furnish appropriate auxiliary aids and services where necessary to afford an individual with a disability an equal opportunity to participate in, and enjoy the benefits of, a service, program, or activity conducted by a public entity

(2) In determining what type of auxiliary aid and service is necessary, a public entity shall give primary consideration to the requests of the individual with disabilities

* * *

§ 35 164 Duties

This subpart does not require a public entity to take any action that it can demonstrate would result in a fundamental alteration in the nature of a service, program, or activity or in undue financial and administrative burdens

Code of Federal Regulations, Title 28, Part 35, Subpart A – General (28 C F R Part 35) provides

§ 35 104 Definitions

For purposes of this part, the term –
* * *

Auxiliary aids and services includes—

(1) Qualified interpreters, notetakers, transcription services, written materials, telephone handset amplifiers, assistive listening

devices, assistive listening systems, telephones compatible with hearing aids, closed caption decoders, open and closed captioning, telecommunications devices for deaf persons (TDD's), videotext displays, or other effective methods of making aurally delivered materials available to individuals with hearing impairments,

(2) Qualified readers, taped texts, audio recordings, Brailled materials, large print materials, or other effective methods of making visually delivered materials available to individuals with visual impairments,

(3) Acquisition or modification of equipment or devices, and

(4) Other similar services and actions

STATEMENT

The University of California has 226,000 undergraduate and graduate students [1] Nationally, students with disabilities represent approximately 11% of students in postsecondary schools [2] This represents a substantial growth in the number of disabled students in postsecondary education [3]

---

[1] Statistical summaries of student enrollment are published by the University and available on its website at http //www ucop edu/ucophome/uwnews/stat/

[2] Government Accountability Office, Higher Education and Disability, *Report to the Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives* (October 2009) Report GAO-10-33, at p 8, available at http //www gao gov/products/GAO-10-33

[3] *Ibid* The GAO reports that, from 1999 to 2007, California reported a 20 percent increase in disabled students and New York reported a 40 percent increase in the number of undergraduate and graduate students with disabilities *Ibid*

Petitioner was a disabled student at the University of California, Boalt School of Law Petitioner commenced his legal studies in Fall 2000 To accommodate Petitioner's disability, the University agreed to provide Petitioner his law school reading materials in large print Also, the University stipulated that large print was not an undue financial or administrative burden IV ER 803 11-14, II ER 97-98 Notwithstanding this agreement, University only managed haphazard compliance with its commitments Typically Petitioner received the materials weeks and months late, after the class sessions to which they related III ER 548-549, see also III ER 543-545 [4]

Receiving large print reading materials late impacted Petitioner's ability to study and participate in class III ER 542 22-543 22 Without the materials Petitioner was "totally lost in class " III ER 543 21 He was unable to discuss the materials with other students III ER 543 23-544 2 He could not follow along with the lectures III ER 564 1-6

By the end of Petitioner's first semester of law school, Petitioner had to delay his course examinations because he had not received the large print reading materials in time to study for the tests III ER 552 2-9 For his second semester in Spring 2001, Petitioner took a reduced course load III ER 552 16-21, 553 8-19 Again, however, Petitioner did not receive his course materials on time III ER 553 20-554 1 By the end of the Spring 2001 semester, Petitioner had still been unable to complete examinations from the Fall semester and could not take the Spring semester examinations either III ER 557 17-23 Petitioner

---

[4] "ER" refers to the volume and page of the Excerpts of Record filed in the Ninth Circuit

ultimately took some examinations over the summer III ER 558 1-4

The problems with late large print reading materials continued in Petitioners third semester, Fall 2001 III ER 562 13-24 Petitioner contacted the University's ADA Compliance Officer, Ward Newmeyer, about the chronically late materials III ER 565-566, 486-487 Newmeyer conducted an investigation during the remainder of the Fall 2001 semester II ER 301, III ER 566, 427-428, 461-462

On January 17, 2002, Newmeyer issued a report on his investigation III ER 567-568, IV ER 698 Newmeyer's report (directed to Petitioner's counsel) stated "I have concluded my investigation and found that you are correct that the University has agreed to provide Mr Simonelli with reproductions of course materials in large (32 point) type" Newmeyer also stated "A new procedure is now in place to provide copies to Mr Simonelli for the upcoming semester, and DSP[5] is confident that it will result in timely, legible copies" IV ER 698

The University still failed to provide Petitioner timely large-print materials during the Spring 2002 semester III ER 570-571, 572-573, 574-575, 586 21-587 2, 492 3-7 Petitioner had to delay his course exams because he had not received his material in time to study for the course examinations from fall of 2000 (first semester of law school) to fall of 2002 – *a two year period* Mr Simonelli's law school transcript contained *numerous "NR" (No Record) notations rather than grades* – and he was not hired by law firms through the

---

5 "DSP" refers to the Disabled Students Program at the University of California at Berkeley

law school's On-Campus Interview Program ("OCIP") See copy of Mr Simonelli's law school transcript dated September 17, 2002, reprinted at App pages 7b-10b, *infra*

Soon after Newmeyer's letter dated January 17, 2002, the law school responded with a letter dated February 6, 2002, from Associate Dean Jan Vetter Dean Vetter wrote that Mr Simonelli, "must withdraw"from school, and by not withdrawing from school, he "would threaten the interest of the Law School and the University " See Associate Dean Jan Vetter letter at page 6b, reprinted at App pages 3b-6b, *infra*

It was a continued failure to accommodate as agreed that prompted this lawsuit

However, as a result of court-supervised settlement agreements after Petitioner initiated this action, the University began using an outside copy service (Copy Central) to enlarge the course materials III ER 576 4-17 Once the University began using Copy Central, Petitioner received his course materials on time III ER 585 2-23, 579-580, 583, 379 10-15, 387 7-25

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

It is crucial to keep state action through the University from becoming all domineering, all powerful, by infringing on our most cherished liberties – the freedom of speech and the freedom of association and assembly The University's state actions that are available on-line, will influence the actions of other public entities and universities on how disabled students throughout the country will understand their rights

The First Amendment provides that "Congress shall make no law abriging the freedom of speech, or to assemble " The Fourteenth Amendment makes these limitations applicable to states, See Gitlow v New York, 268 US 652 (1925) and to their political subdivisions and agents, see Lovell v City Griffin, 303 US 444 (1938)

In the City of Laduc v Gilleo, 512 US 42 (1994), Margaret Gilleo tried to put up a peace sign during the Persian Gulf War – city officials cited her under an ordinance that banned all yard signs except for "For Sale" signs In writing for the Court, Justice Stevens said this law, "swallowed up too much expression " The First Amendment affords all individuals – regardless of wealth or power – the ability to convey their expressions

The Gilleo case and the cases that follow, though factually distinct from the instant case are nevertheless instructive because these cases confirm the basic principle cited above – freedom of speeh through the exchange of ideas

I THE UNIVERSITY EITHER EXCLUDED PETITIONER FROM PARTICIPATING IN – OR DENIED HIM THE BENEFITS OF – THE UNIVERSITY'S SERVICES, PROGRAMS, OR ACTIVITIES, OR THE UNIVERSITY OTHERWISE DISCRIMINATED AGAINST HIM BECAUSE IT FAILED TO PROVIDE HIM WITH LARGE-PRINT READING MATERIALS PRIOR TO LAW SCHOOL SCHOOL CLASSES – TO ENABLE MR SIMONELLI TO CONVEY HIS EXPRESSIONS AND EXCHANGE HIS IDEAS AND FREEDOM OF ASSOCIATION ACROSS THE LAW SCHOOL ACADEMIC SPECTRUM.

The University had almost completely foreclosed an entire medium of expression and association For example, Petitioner was excluded from participating in class because he could not refer to his reading materials for approximamately two years See *supra* pp 5-6 Mr Simonelli could not participate in "on call" days See Professor Berring's email to the entire class, "The Syllabus for the Week of November 27" dated November 20, 2000, and reprinted as App page 2b, *infra* He could not discuss cases and reading assignments with law school classmates and his professors Mr Simonelli could not take advantage of the law school social experiences Petitioner could not graduate on time with his graduating Class of 2003 In other words, Mr Simonelli lost the equal educational opportunity – an opportunity that was enjoyed by the non-disabled students

II. THE UNIVERSITY IS STRICTLY LIABLE BECAUSE IT KNEW ITS FAILURE TO PROVIDE LARGE PRINT READING MATERIALS BEFORE CLASS WOULD PRECLUDE MR. SIMONELLI FROM PARTICIPATING IN CLASS AND CONVEYING HIS EXPRESSIONS AND IDEAS IN VIOLATION OF HIS FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHTS

The only reason Petitioner was excluded from conveying his ideas was because he needed the accommodation of large print reading materials prior his classes so that he could read, study and prepare for each class Mr Simonelli would not been requesting the large print accommodation but for his limited vision disability

The freedom of individuals to communicate their ideas to others and the right to assemble and associate with others – ensures the greatest possible dissemination of information and the unfettered interchange of ideas See Roth v United States, 354 US 476, 484 (1957)

An eminent student of rhetoric observed that the identity of speaker is an important component of many attempts to persuade See Aristotle 2, Rhetoric, Book 1, Ch 2, in Eight Great Books of the Western World, Encyclopedia Brittanica 595 CM Adler ed 2d ed 1980 Cited in City of Laduc at p 59, *supra* p 8

The cases below concern student free speech rights It should be noted that those cases generally involve grammar schools or high schools No doubt the courts recognize that the age and maturity of the students are important factors to be considered

In West Virginia State Board of Ed v Barnette, 319 US 624 (1943) the Court held that compelling public school children to salute the flag was unconstitutional The Court reasoned such a salute was a form of utterance and was a means of communicating ideas "Compulsory unification of opinion," the Court held was doomed to failure and antithetical to First Amendment values

The Court further commented, "[T]hat they are educating the young for citizenship is reason for scrupulous protection of constitutional freedoms of the individual, if we are not to strangle the free mind at its source and teach youth to discount important principles of our government as mere platitudes "

Justice Murphy, concurring, reasoned that the right freedom of thought as gauranteed by the Consitution versus state action includes both the right to speak freely and the right to refrain from speaking at all

The seminal case on the scope of student free speech rights was black-armband case Tinker v Des Moines Independent Community School District, 393 US 503 (1969) The Court ruled 7-2, that the First Amendment, as applied through the Fourteenth Amendment, did not permit a public school to censor student expression, absent any evidence that the student's speech would cause a substantial interference with school discipline or the rights of others To justify censoring speech, the school, "must be able to show that [its] action was caused by something more than a mere desire to avoid the discomfort and unpleasantness that always accompany an unpopular viewpoint," – the school must show that the conduct in question, "would materially and substantially interfere with the requirements of

appropriate discipline in the operation of the school" The Court found the Tinker's in wearing armbands protesting the U S involvement in the Vietnam War, did not cause disruption in school activities – in fact, their actions represented consitutionally protected symbolic speech

The Tinker test is still followed by courts today in determining whether a school's disciplinary actions violate student's First Amendment rights – though later Court decisions have somewhat limited the scope of student's free speech rights

In Bethel School District v Fraser, 476 US 675 (1986), the Court held that a high school student's lewd and vulgar speech during a student assembly was "plainly offensive" and not constitutionally protected

Hazelwood v Kuhlmeir, 484 US 260 (1988), where the Court ruled that schools have the right to restrict student's speech in the context of school-sponsored instead of student-initiated speech, such as school newspapers if reasonablely related to a legitimate educational purpose

In Morse v Fredrick, 551 US 393 (2007), the Court held that school may, consistant with the First Amendment, limit student speech when that speech is reasonabely viewed as promoting illegal drug use

High school student Fredrick held a banner across the street from his high school with a message, "Bong hits 4 Jesus"in front of TV cameras as the Olympic torch passed by The school asked Fredrick to take down the banner, believing it advocated illegal drug use When Fredrick refused he was suspended – he sued on First

Amendment grounds Chief Justice Roberts, writing for the majority, rejected an argument by the school that Fredrick's speech could be punished because it was "plainly offensive" within the meaning of the Fraser case Chief Justice Roberts warned against extending the "plainly offensive" ruling, writing "We think this stretches Fraser too far, that should not read to encompass any speech that could fit under some definition of 'offensive' After all, much political and religious speech might be offensive to some" Chief Justice Roberts also rejected an argument by the school that the analysis in Fredrick was controlled by Kuhlmeir Chief Justice Roberts wrote "Kuhlmeir does not control this case because no one would readily believe that Fredrick's banner bore school's imprimatur"

In his dissent, Justice Stevens reasoned, "serious violence to the First Amendment" is done when the Court upholds a student's punishment for speech with which it disagrees

The instant case involved a law school Law schools have been training grounds for the nation's citizens and future leaders The state through the University of California, Berkeley, did not have a compelling governmental interest in denying Mr Simonelli his rights of liberty to express his ideas with others and to associate with others in the law school academic environment – because it failed to provide large print reading materials prior to Petitioner's classes, so that he could read, prepare and study for each class *The fundamental rights of freedom of speech and freedom of association that are explicitly or implicitly guaranteed by the Constitution – trigger strict judicial scrutiny*

under the First Amendment – the highest level of protection

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Petitioner submits that a Petition for Rehearing should issue

Respectfully submitted,

Antonio C Simonelli
Pro Se

P O Box 119
Ross, California 94957
PH# (415) 453-1781

GOOD FAITH CERTIFICATION

I, Antonio C Simonelli, pro se, certify that pursuant to Rule 44 2 this petition is restricted to substantial grounds not previously presented, and that it is presented in good faith and not for delay

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct

Executed on May 20, 2010

_____

Antonio C Simonelli
Pro Se

P O Box 119
Ross, California 94957
PH# (415) 453-1781

Supreme Court of the United States
Office of the Clerk
Washington, DC 20543-0001

William K Suter
Clerk of the Court
(202) 479-3011

April 26, 2010

Mr Antonio C Simonelli
P O Box 119
Ross, CA 94957

Re Antonio C Simonelli v University of California at Berkeley, et al
No 09-1016

Dear Mr Simonelli

The Court today entered the following order in the above-entitled case

The petition for a writ of certiorari is denied Justice Breyer took no part in the consideration or decision of this petition

Sincerely,

William K Suter, Clerk

Yahoo! MAIL

The Syllabus for the Week of November 27
Monday, November 20, 2000 3 52 PM

From "Robert Berring" <berringlaw berkeley edu>

To "202F Section 3 – Contracts – Berring" law202f-3@law berkeley edu, msrykin@boalthall berkeley edu, zumbolt@yahoo com, doigita@aol com.,
johnac@boalthall berkeley edu,
jackie76@boalthall berkeley edu,
mkwinn@boalthall berkeley edu,
joshlerner@hotmail com, carolkingery@yahoo com

1 File (22KB)

Here it is I assigned folks to "on call" duty, but feel free to jump in whenever you'd like

BB

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

BERKELEY – DAVIS – IRVINE – LOS ANGELES – RIVERSIDE – SAN DIEGO – SAN FRANCISCO – SANTA BARBARA – SANTA CR

SCHOOL OF LAW BOALTHALL
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 41720-7* **

February 6, 2002

Tony Simonelli
P O Box 119
Ross, CA 94957

Dear Mr Simonelli

Since Dean Ortiz and I met with you and Mr Katzenbach on January 23 we have carefully reviewed our respective positions on the question how you might best continue your legal education here at Boalt Hall

As you will recall, we expressed the view that you should withdraw from school in Spring 2002 and devote yourself to finishing the courses in which you have been enrolled but have not taken the final examination You and Mr Katzenbach on the other hand took the position that you should continue with the courses in which you have enrolled for Spring 2002 and upon (presumably) satisfactory completion of those courses at the end of the semester develop a plan for taking the examinations in the courses now unfinished

We have concluded that it is vital to your prospects for successful completion of your law studies that you

adopt the course we outlined at our meeting At the end of your first year here you did not take the examination in one of your spring semester courses You also had not enrolled in Torts (a five-unit course), which is normally required in the first year At the end of the fall semester of your second year (Fall 2001) you did not take the examinations given in three of your courses Thus you have not completed four of the nine courses in which you have been enrolled during your first three semesters of law school and have still not taken the required Torts course The unit value of your fall semester courses was twelve, as is the unit value of your spring semester courses, however, normal progress toward a degree requires an average of thirteen and one-half units in each semester of the second and third years Consequently, you would be nine units behind at the end of Spring 2002 even if you satisfactorily completed all your courses Owing to your disability you receive accommodations in taking examinations that go well beyond any exam accommodations previously granted any student – one week in which to take each examination with one week between examinations These accommodations entail a minimum of several weeks' time past the normal examination period for you to finish a semester's work If you were to make normal progress toward a degree, this would require for any fall semester that you continue preparing and taking examinations while performing the work assigned in your spring semester courses, a regimen that you are unprepared to undertake this semester For the spring semester much of the summer would be taken up with examinations

Two of the courses in which you have enrolled this semester have as a prerequisite completion of the basic

course in Corporations, one of the courses in which you have not taken the examination You did not take the required Torts course during Fall 2001 nor have you enrolled in it in Spring 2002 You propose to defer until this summer the development of any concrete plan to deal with the backlog of courses that you have accrued through your first three semesters of law school, while the material covered in those courses continues to recede in memory Further, we can only speculate about whether you will be able to complete successfully the courses you take in Spring 2002

You attribute the difficulty you have experienced in finishing courses to the failure of the Disabled Students Program to obtain for you some of the required materials in your courses in the format – 32-point bold type – that you need in order to read it, and you expect this problem to be overcome or mostly so, in this semester While it is true that the University has been late in furnishing some part of the required course materials, it does not appear to us that you are entirely without responsibility Moreover, as pointed out in Ward Newmeyer's "Summary of Boalt student complaint about auxiliary services" of January 4, 2002, providing the particular accommodation upon which you insist is by no means a simple or straightforward matter As Mr Newmeyer also points out, there remains some question whether this accommodation is appropriate, given that it appears to cause you severe pain and to exacerbate your condition, it is only because of your insistence that the accommodation of supplying course materials in 32-point bold type has been chosen in preference to alternatives, such as readers or tapes In sum, we are less confident that you seem to be that the difficulties of the past will be wholly overcome in

the future Under these circumstances we have concluded that to allow you to continue on your proposed course would place you in severe academic jeopardy and threaten the interest of the Law School and the University in your successful completion of a sound legal education

Accordingly, we have decided that you must withdraw from the courses in which you have enrolled for this semester and work with the office of the Dean of Students to a plan for taking the examinations and finishing the courses you have left uncompleted and for going on toward earning your degree before proceeding further with new courses Please contact Dean Ortiz at your earliest convenience to begin this process

Sincerely,

Jan Vetter
Associate Dean

cc Christopher W Katzenbach

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY SCHOOLS OF *****
Printed 09/17/02
ID 2-3762
NAME OF STUDENT SIMONELLI, ANTONIO CARLIN
COLLEGE SCHOOL OF LAW
DEGREE PROGRAM LAW
DATE ADMITTED AUG 00

* Indicates Fulfillment of the Writing Requirement
* Indicates Fulfillment of the Professional Responsibility Requirement
TFR Indicates Law School Transfer Units Accepted
JTO Indicates Joint Degree Units Accepted

Degrees

U OF CALIFORNIA BERKELEY 2000
Academic Notes
MOOT COURT ADVOCACY AWARD

7b

Term	Fall 2000					
Dept	Course	Title	Instructor	Unit	JD Un	Grade
AW	200F	CIVIL PROCEDURE	VETTER	4 0	4.0	P
AW	202F	***TRACTS	BERRING	5 0	5.0	P
AW	2021 A	LEGAL RES & WRITING	PETRINE	2.0	2 0	CR
AW	230	CRIMINAL LAW	KADISH	4 0	4 0	H
				TOTAL	JD	
				UNIT	UNIT	
			SEMESTER·	15 0	15 0	
			CUMULATIVE	15 0	15 0	
Term	Spring 2001					
Dept	Course	Title	Instructor	Unit	JD Un	Grade
LAW	203	PROERTY	HAMEY COPE	4 0	4 0	P
LAW	220	CONSTITUTIONAL LAW	YOO	3 0	3.0	NR
LAW	202**	MOOT COURT		1 0	1 0	CR

				TOTAL	JD	
				UNIT	UNIT	
			SEMESTER	5 0	5 0	
			CUMULATIVE:	20 0	20.0	
Term.	Fall 2001					
Dept	Course	Title	Instructor	Unit	JD Un	Grade
LAW	210	LEGAL PROFESSION	STEELE	3 0	3 0	NR
LAW	250A	CORPORATIONS I	CHOI	3 0	3.0	NR
LAW	254A	SECURITIES REG I	SCM5INI	2 0	2 0	NR
POL S**	210	SEL TOPS COMP POL	GREGOR	4 0	4 0	A
				TOTAL	JD	
				UNIT	UNIT	
			SEMESTER			
			CUMULATIVE			
Term	Spring 2002					
Dept·	Course	Title	Instructor	Unit	JD Un	Grade

BUS ADM	296	SPEC TOPS BUS ADMIN	ROBINSON	3 0	3 0	I
LAW	2508	CORPORATIONS II	FRIED	2 0	2 0	NR
LAW	2539	CREDITORS RIGHTS	WINN	3 0	3 0	NR
LAW	2548	SECURITIES REG II	SONSINI	2 0	2 0	NR
LAW	2775	MERGE/ACQUI HIGHTEC	KENNEDY	2 0	2 0	NR
				TOTAL	JD	
				UNIT	UNIT	
			SEMESTER	0 0	0 0	
			CUMULATIVE	2 4 0	2 4 0	
Term	Fall 2002					
Dept	Course	Title	Instructor	Unit	JD Un	Grade
LAW	255	COMMERCIAL TRANSACT	KOSEL	3 0	3.0	
LAW	258	ESTATES AND TRUSTS	FERGUSON	3 0	3 0	
				TOTAL	JD	

				UNIT	UNIT	
			SEMESTER	0 0	0 0	
			CUMULATIVE	24.0	24 0	